

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, and 13-15 are now pending in the application and, by this paper, are amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as failing to show S130 as a step of determining whether a header is selected, as described in paragraph [0053] of the Specification and as failing to show S150 as a step of determining whether to return to the preceding page, as described in paragraph [0055] of the Specification. The objection is respectfully traversed. To expedite prosecution, however, Applicants have attached a revised Figure 4 for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheet," Figure 4 has been amended as follows: Text for S130 has been changed from "SELECT?" to "HEADER SELECTED OR END?"; Text for S150 has been changed from "SELECT?" to "RETURN TO PRECEDING PAGE OR END?"; Line description for line connecting S130 to S140 has been changed from "SELECTED" to "HEADER SELECTED"; and Line description for line connection S150 to S120 has been added as "RETURN TO PRECEDING PAGE."

The amendments are made to match the drawings to the description set forth in paragraphs [0053] and [0055] of the Specification. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

The drawings also stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Examiner indicates that none of the drawings show a short-cut link incorporating a plurality of part codes as

parameters of a URL, the plurality of part codes corresponding to the parts selected from the plurality of parts. The objection is respectfully traversed.

As noted by the Examiner, a short-cut link 28 is shown in Figure 1. See Office Action 11/6/2009, p. 4. Although the Examiner refers to the short-cut link 28 as an icon, paragraph [0050] refers to it as "short-cut link 28." As described in paragraph [0050], the short-cut link 28 is set on the desktop screen.

In this way, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed feature of a short-cut link is properly shown in the drawings as short-cut link 28 of Figure 1. Applicants note that the short-cut link is described in further detail in paragraph [0050], by way of an example, as follows:

An example of the short-cut link 28 is illustrated below. In the short-cut link 28:

"http://support.*****.co.jp/faq/"

is a URL of the support information site offered by the FAQ server 36, and parameters after "?" in:

"?com***,win***,cpu***,----"

are part codes representing the kind of the computer body, kind of the OS, kind of the CPU and the like.

http://support.*****.co.jp/faq/?com***,win***,cpu***,----

In this way, Applicants respectfully submit that the short-cut link recited by claim 1 is properly shown in the Figures, in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) and properly described in the Specification.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 7-9, and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Lee, U.S. Pat. No. 6,240,420 ("Lee") and HTML 4.01 Specification ("HTML 4.01"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a product management system including a production management server and an information offering apparatus for offering, via a communication network, information to a user of a product comprising a computer produced by combining parts selected from a plurality of parts. The information offering apparatus includes a request-receiving means for receiving a request for offering information of the product from the user via the communication network, the request being generated by execution by the user of a short-cut link on a desktop screen of the computer, the short-cut link incorporating a plurality of part codes as parameters of a URL, the plurality of part codes corresponding to the parts selected from the plurality of parts. The production management server, upon receiving information indicating a completion of an inspection of the computer, forms and transmits an e-mail to the user having a link that is the same as the short-cut link on the desktop screen of the computer. Execution by the user of the link generates a request for offering information

of the product from the user that is received by the request-receiving means of the information offering apparatus via the communication network.

Lee and HTML 4.01 fail to teach or suggest the product management system recited by claim 1.

As noted by the Examiner, Lee does not teach or suggest a request being generated by execution by a user of a short-cut link on a desktop screen of a computer, the short-cut link incorporating a plurality of part codes as parameters of a URL, as recited by claim 1. *See* Office Action, 11/6/2009, p. 7. Similarly, Lee also does not teach or suggest a production management server that, upon receiving information indicating a completion of an inspection of the computer, forms and transmits an e-mail to the user having a link that is the same as the short-cut link on the desktop screen of the computer, execution by the user of the link generating a request for offering information of the product from the user that is received by the request-receiving means of the information offering apparatus via the communication network., as recited by claim 1.

These limitations are also not taught or suggested by HTML 4.01. For example, in HTML 4.01, a URI is constructed when a form is submitted that may be used as an anchor-style link. *See* HTML 4.01, Section B.2.2. HTML 4.01 is silent, however, as to a production management server that, upon receiving information indicating a completion of an inspection of the computer, forms and transmits an e-mail to the user having a link that is the same as the short-cut link on the desktop screen of the computer, execution by the user of the link generating a request for offering information of the product from

the user that is received by the request-receiving means of the information offering apparatus via the communication network., as recited by claim 1.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 defines over the prior art. Claims 2-4 and 7-9 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and likewise define over the prior art. Limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1 are also recited by claim 13. For at least the above reasons, claim 13 likewise defines over the prior art. Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 13 and likewise define over the prior art.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 6,240,420), HTML 4.01 Specification (HTML 4.01) and Meyer et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,826,715). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 6 depends indirectly from claim 1 which defines over the prior art as discussed in detail above. For at least the above reasons, claim 6 likewise defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Lee (U.S. Pat. No. 6,240,420), HTML 4.01 Specification (HTML 4.01) and Sidie (U.S. Pat. No. 6,170,056). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 11 depends indirectly from claim 1 which defines over the prior art as discussed in detail above. For at least the above reasons, claim 6 likewise defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 5, 2010

By: /G. Gregory Schivley/
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/MPD/mk

15190000 1